

## REMARKS

### **I. Introduction**

With the addition of new claims 5 to 9, claims 1 to 9 are pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **II. Rejection of Claims 1 to 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1 to 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Becker et al., "Automatic Parallelism Exploitation for FPL-based Accelerators" ("the Becker reference") and Hartenstein et al., "A Two-Level Co-Design Framework for Xputer-based Data-Driven Reconfigurable Accelerators" ("the Hartenstein reference"). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the Becker and Hartenstein references does not render unpatentable any of the present claims, and the rejection should be withdrawn, for at least the following reason.

Claim 1 relates to a method for partitioning a program, and, as herein amended without prejudice, provides for partitioning a program such that the program's parts minimize execution time, a mapping onto the reconfigurable array does not exceed the maximum allowable size, and an overhead for reconfiguring the reconfigurable array is minimized. The combination of the Becker and Hartenstein references does not disclose or suggest partitioning such that overhead is minimized, as provided for in the context of claim 1.

Accordingly, the combination of the Becker and Hartenstein references does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1, and therefore does not render unpatentable claim 1.

Each of claims 2 and 3 includes subject matter analogous to that discussed above in support of the patentability of claim 1, and is therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reason as claim 1. Claim 4 depends from claim 3 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reason as claim 3.

Withdrawal of this obvious rejection of claims 1 to 4 is therefore respectfully requested.

**III. New Claims 5 to 9**

Claims 5 to 9 were added. Claims 5 to 9 do not add new matter and are supported by the present application, including specification as originally filed.

Claim 5 refers to strategies for loading configurations to cache, which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Claim 5 and its dependent claim 6 and 7 are therefore allowable.

Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 9 refers to partitioning a program, where the partitioned parts are mapped onto a plurality ALUs and onto a plurality of memory units. The Office Action refers to the Becker reference as assertedly disclosing program partitioning according to a maximum allowable size to be mapped onto an array, and admits that the Becker reference does not refer to an array of units that includes memory units. Instead, the Office Action refers to the Hartenstein reference as assertedly disclosing that the array of the Becker reference may further include memory units. However, even if the array of the Becker reference would include memory units, neither the Becker reference nor the Hartenstein reference, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses or suggests mapping partitioned parts of a program onto such memory units. Claim 9 is therefore allowable over the combination of the Becker and Hartenstein references.

**IV. Conclusion**

It is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 26, 2010

By: /Aaron Grunberger/  
Aaron Grunberger  
Reg. No. 59,210

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO 26646**